DRAFT SCOPING REPORT

UNEV Pipeline
Environmental Impact Statement

Provided For:

Bureau of Land Management
Utah State Office
440 West 200 South, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Provided By:

jbr environmental consultants, inc.

8160 S. Highland Drive
Sandy, Utah 84093

October 26, 2007

Table of Contents

Tables

Appendices

Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Public Scoping

The purpose of scoping is to allow the public, agencies, and interested parties to comment on the range of issues to be addressed during the environmental review process. During the scoping process, the lead agency presents the broad outlines of a project and solicits input as to issues, concerns, and opportunities that might arise as a result of project implementation. It is a process required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) in the early stages of preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Scoping is intended to encourage public participation and solicit public input on the scope and significance of the proposed action (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1501.7). Comments received during scoping help the agency identify issues and concerns, determine the level of analysis needed, and develop alternatives.

This report summarizes comments, feedback, and input received from the public, agencies, and other interested parties during the public scoping period of August 9, 2007 – September 10, 2007. All comments received by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) prior to September 14, 2007 were processed and included in this Scoping Report. Later comments were still accepted and read, and substantive comments advanced for consideration, though they were not included in this report.

1.2 Project Description

UNEV Pipeline, LLC (UNEV) is proposing to construct and operate a 400-mile, 12-inch petroleum products pipeline that is proposed to originate near the refineries in Woods Cross, Utah with terminals near Cedar City, Utah and Las Vegas, Nevada. The southern half of the pipeline alignment would generally follow the existing Kern River pipeline corridor. The pipeline inlet would be located near Holly Corporation's Woods Cross, Utah refinery which announced last year its intent to upgrade its crude oil processing capabilities enabling the refinery to process high value, low priced black wax crude oil and heavy Canadian crude oils.

The outlet terminals for the proposed pipeline would be located northwest of Cedar City, Utah and near Apex, Nevada (northeast of Las Vegas). In addition to the inlet pumping station, one additional pumping station is proposed near the pipeline midpoint in Millard County, Utah, with pressure reduction stations located at the terminals. A portion of the corridor contains two Kern River Pipeline Company natural gas pipelines, the newest of which was constructed in 2003. The Kern River Pipeline Environmental Impact Statement was completed in 2002. The proposed UNEV Pipeline would originate in Davis County, Utah and cross Salt Lake, Tooele, Juab, Millard, Beaver, Iron, and Washington Counties. In Nevada the pipeline would cross Lincoln County and terminate in Clark County.

Related facilities would include access roads to all above ground facilities, including valves and launchers and receiving equipment. Other related facilities would include construction and equipment storage yards.

1.3 Description of the Scoping Process

1.3.1 Notice of Intent

The Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on Thursday, August 9, 2007 (72 FR 44851-44852) and is included in Appendix A. Additional legal notices (Appendix A) were published in local newspapers as follows:

Table 1. Publication of Legal Notices

Date	Publication
Thursday August 9, 2007	Tooele Transcript Bulletin
Friday August 10, 2007	Las Vegas Review Journal
Friday August 10, 2007	The St. George Spectrum
Saturday August 11, 2007	The Salt Lake Tribune
Saturday August 11, 2007	Deseret Morning Newspaper
Tuesday August 14, 2007	Millard County Gazette
Wednesday August 15, 2007	Millard County Chronicle Progress

In addition, advance meetings with area officials and special interest groups (see Table 2 below) were conducted before the public scoping meetings to brief them on the project, obtain feedback, and to notify them of the NEPA process.

Table 2. Pre-scoping Meetings

Organization	Contact
Ambassador Duck Club	Representative
Beaver County	Administrative Assistant, Commissioner, Planning Administrator, Assistant Planning Administrator
Bernum Duck Club	Representative
Black Hawk Duck Club	Representative
Brown Duck Club	Representative
Cedar City Mayor	Mayor Sherratt
City of North Salt Lake	City Manager & City Engineer
Clark County Commissioner	Chris Giunchigliani
Clark County Commissioner	Rory Reid
Delta City	Mayor, Public Works Director
Division of Wildlife Resources	Pam Krammer
Friends of the Great Salt Lake	Director
Great Salt Lake Keeper	Director

Organization	Contact
Harrison Duck Club	Representative
Hinckley Town	Mayor
Iron County	Zoning Administrator, Iron County Planner
Juab County	City Administrator
Lake Front Duck Club	Representative
Las Vegas Fuel Standards Environmental	Committee
Las Vegas Mayor	Mayor Goodman
Lynndyl Town	Mayor
McCarren International Airport	Randall Walker, Rosemary Vassil, Barbara Bolton
Milford City	City Manager
Millard County	County Commissioner
Nellis Air Force Base	Planning Division, Environmental Division
Nevada State Senator	Warren Hardy
Nevada: The Nature Conservancy	Project Director
New State Duck Club	Representative
North Las Vegas Councilwoman	Shari Buck
North Las Vegas Mayor	Mayor Michael Montandon
North Point Duck Club	Representative
Rudy Duck Club	Representative
Salt Lake City	City Engineer Director, Senior Technology Consultant, Finance Division
Salt Lake County	Planner
Salt Lake International Airport	Steve Domino, John Buckner
Salt Lake International Center	Kim Hibbert
South Shore Wetlands Association	Representative
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	Dave Garbett
St. George Economic Development	Director
St. George Mayor	Mayor MacAurther
Stockton Town	Mayor
Tooele Army Depot	Tom Turner, Larry McFarland
Tooele City	City Mayor, City Engineer, Public Works Director
Tooele County	County Engineers
US Fish and Wildlife	Paul Abate
Utah Congressman Matheson	District Director
Utah Petroleum Association	Director

Organization	Contact
Utah Petroleum Marketers & Retailers Association	Director
Utah: Governor's Energy Advisor	Laura Nelson
Utah: Governor's Energy Advisor	Dianne Nielson
Utah: The Nature Conservancy	Director
Vernon	Mayor
Wasatch Duck Club	Representative
Washington County	Planning Commission
Wetlands Management Association	Director, Legal Representative
Woods Cross	City Administrator
Zions Securities Corporation	Project Director

A scoping letter (Appendix A) was prepared and sent to a list of approximately 1,000 potentially interested individuals, agencies, and organizations. The BLM compiled the initial contact list (Appendix B) by using contact lists from previous projects.

In addition, a postcard (Appendix A) was mailed to the same list notifying the public of a new e-mail address set up to receive public comments.

1.3.2 Scoping Meetings

Scoping meetings were held during the weeks of August 20th and 27th, 2007 at the following locations:

Salt Lake City
Wednesday, August 22
Hampton Inn
307 North Admiral Byrd Road
Salt Lake City, Utah

Tooele
Thursday, August 23
Tooele Senior Citizens Center
59 East Vine
Tooele, Utah

Las Vegas
Monday, August 27
Las Vegas BLM Field Office
4701 North Torrey Pines
Las Vegas, Nevada

Cedar City
Wednesday, August 29
Cedar City Library
303 North 100 East
Cedar City, Utah

Delta
Thursday, August 30
Delta Middle School
251 East 300 North
Delta, Utah

All attendees were asked to sign in and provide their contact information (Appendix C). The open houses were held between 5:00 – 8:00 PM.

There were 11 information display stations with maps and UNEV personnel available to answer questions about the proposed project. Comment forms (Appendix A) were available to all attendees to provide written comments. Comments could be submitted during the meeting, mailed, or e-mailed.

All responses received by BLM were logged, analyzed, and summarized to discern issues of concern. Chapter 2 below details this process.

1.3.3 Consultation with Moapa Band of the Paiutes

Several meetings were held with members of the Moapa Band of the Paiutes. These meetings generally included representatives of the BLM, UNEV representatives, third-party environmental contractors, and members of the Tribal Council. The purpose of the meetings was to discuss the environmental analysis process for the project and address tribal concerns. The most recent meeting was held during the scoping period on Tuesday, August 28, 2007 in Moapa.

1.3.4 Project Websites

Information regarding the proposed action and the NEPA process is posted on the BLM's project website at:

http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/prog/more/lands_and_realty/unev_pipeline_eis.html

The proponent also has developed a website to disseminate project information to the public and is found at:

http://projects.ch2m.com/unev/public/

Chapter 2 - Demographic Summary

2.1 Demographic Analysis

Demographic analysis allows managers to form an overall picture of who is submitting comments, where they live, their general affiliation with various organizations or government agencies, and the manner in which they respond. The comment database can be used to isolate specific combinations of information about public comment. For example, reports run from the database can single out public comment from people in California or identify specific types of land users such as recreational groups, the energy industry, or businesses. Demographic coding allows managers to focus on specific areas of concern linked to respondent categories, geographic areas, and response types.

Although demographic information is captured and tracked, it is important to note that the consideration of public comment is not a vote-counting process. Every comment and suggestion has value, whether expressed by one or a thousand respondents. All input is considered, and the BLM attempts to capture all substantive public concerns in the analysis process.

2.2 Method of Response Collection and Analysis

All hard copy responses (from facsimile transmissions, comment forms, and letters) received by the BLM were copied and sent to the contractor for processing and content analysis. Originals were maintained at the BLM Utah State Office. E-mails were forwarded to the contractor. Responses were processed by the contractor using the following general procedure.

2.2.1 Response Processing

Unique responses were logged, and names and addresses were entered into a mailing list database. The logging process was also used to identify and eliminate duplicate responses. All duplicates identified during this phase were labeled and filed with the original response document.

Each unique piece of communication that required coding was assigned a letter number, scanned, filed in soft and hard copy, and a working copy was printed out for comment coding. Implementation of this process with its embedded quality control procedures ensured that all responses were accounted for, without duplication, and transitioned to the coding phase of the process.

2.2.2 Coding

Each unique response was individually read and coded twice to ensure that individual comments, concerns, and issues were captured. Coding consists of identifying discrete comments, delineating them, and assigning unique comment codes and categories (Table 3). In addition, each response was coded for demographic information to be used in later analyses (Tables 4-6).

Table 3. Codes used to categorize individual comments.

Code	General Issue Category
ALT	Alternatives to Proposed Action (development or additional)
AN	Air Quality/Noise
CR	Cultural Resources
CUM	Cumulative Effects
EJ	Environmental Justice
GEO	Geology and Minerals
HAZ	Hazardous and Solid Waste Materials
INF	Request for additional information
LU	Land Use
NAC	Native American Concerns
OOS	Out of scope
PA	Proposed Action
PAL	Paleontological Resources
PN	Purpose of and Need for Project
PRO	Process (comments referring to scoping or NEPA process)
REC	Recreation and Special Interest Areas
RNG	Range Resources (including rangeland health, grazing, wild horses and burros)
SOC	Socioeconomics
SOIL	Soil Resources
SSS	Special Status Species (plants and animals)
TRAN	Transportation
VEG	Vegetation (not including listed or sensitive species)
VR	Visual Resources
WLF	Wildlife (not including listed or sensitive species) and Wildlife Habitat
WR	Water Resources

Table 4. Demographic codes used to identify geographic area.

Code	Geographic Area
ANON	Anonymous/Unknown
BV	Beaver County, UT
CL	Clark County, NV
DV	Davis County, UT
INT	International
IR	Iron County, UT

Code	Geographic Area
JB	Juab County, UT
LN	Lincoln, NV
ML	Millard County, UT
MO	Moapa Reservation
NV-OTH	Nevada – Other Counties
SL	Salt Lake County, UT
TO	Tooele County, UT
US	US – Other States
UT	Utah County, UT
UT-OTH	Utah – Other Counties
WA	Washington County, UT

Table 5. Demographic codes used to identify commenter affiliation.

Code	Affiliation
AGR	Agriculture Industry/Association
BUS	Business
CIV	Civic Group
CNT	County Agency/Elected Official
CON	Conservation/Preservation Organization
ENG	Energy Industry/Association
FED	Federal Agency/Elected Official
GOV	Government Employees, Organizations, Unions
IND	Individual/Unaffiliated
LOC	Local Agency/Elected Official
LOW	Land Owner
MULT	Single Responses Signed by Multiple Organizations
OTH	Other
STA	State Agency/Elected Official
TRB	Tribal Official/Member

Table 6. Demographic codes used to identify response type.

Code	Response Format
C	Comment Form
E	E-mail
F	Fax
L	Letter
O	Other form of communication (e.g., telephone, verbal)

2.2.3 Data Entry

Coded comments for each response letter were then added to the comment spreadsheet. Each coded comment was linked to the response letter and to the commenter. This facilitated later statistical analysis.

2.2.4 Analysis

The comments were sorted by category and letter (see Appendix D). Comment analysts read all the comments in each category and identified distinct public concerns/issues. One or more sample statements (i.e., direct quotes from the responses which reflect that concern) were attached to each issue. Each sample statement is accompanied by a response letter number and other reference material to allow the reader to trace each issue back to the individual respondents who submitted them. These issues are contained in Chapter 3 of this report. A demographic and statistical summary report of organized and unique responses was generated (see Section 2.3) including responses by organization affiliation, response type, and geographic distribution.

2.3 Unique Response Summary

BLM received 58 comment forms, letters, e-mails, and faxes in response to the request for public comment regarding the Proposed Action. A brief statistical analysis is provided below.

Geographic representation is tracked for each response during the course of content analysis. Responses were received from 7 counties within the Project Area and 5 responses came from counties outside of the Project Area, but within Utah and Nevada. There were 10 responses from other states in the U.S and 6 responses from unknown geographic locations.

Table 7. Geographic distribution of responses.

Code	Geographic Area	Number of Responses
ANON	Anonymous/Unknown	6
BV	Beaver County, UT	0
CL	Clark County, NV	5
DV	Davis County, UT	0
INT	International	0
IR	Iron County, UT	3
JB	Juab County, UT	0

Code	Geographic Area	Number of Responses
LN	Lincoln, NV	0
ML	Millard County, UT	4
MO	Moapa Reservation	4
NV-OTH	Nevada – Other Counties	2
SL	Salt Lake County, UT	13
TO	Tooele County, UT	1
US	US – Other States	10
UT	Utah County, UT	1
UT-OTH	Utah – Other Counties	3
WA	Washington County, UT	6

Responses were received from various organizations and unaffiliated individuals. Respondents include businesses, preservation organizations, and the oil and gas industry, as well as unaffiliated individuals and others. Organization types were tracked for each letter, e-mail, or fax received. The most numerous responses were from land owners, businesses, and unaffiliated individuals.

Table 8. Number of responses by organization type.

Code	Affiliation	Number of Responses
AGR	Agriculture Industry/Association	0
BUS	Business	11
CIV	Civic Group	0
CNT	County Agency/Elected Official	0
CON	Conservation/Preservation Organization	6
ENG	Energy Industry/Association	2
FED	Federal Agency/Elected Official	2
GOV	Government Employees, Organizations, Unions	1
IND	Individual/Unaffiliated	14
LOC	Local Agency/Elected Official	1
LOW	Land Owner	12
MULT	Single Responses Signed by Multiple Organizations	1
OTH	Other	1
STA	State Agency/Elected Official	4
TRB	Tribal Official/Member	4

Response/Delivery types were tracked for each response received on the project. Responses were received in the form of comment forms, e-mails, faxes, and letters. E-mail was the most common form of response, followed by BLM comment forms, and letters.

Table 9. Number of responses and signatures by response/delivery type.

Code	Response Format	Number of Responses
C	Comment Form	15
E	E-mail	25
F	Fax	2
L	Letter	13
O	Other	3

Chapter 3 - Public Issue Statements

The following chapter contains summaries of the substantive comments that were identified in all of the unique comments mentioned previously. These are divided into general issue categories (see Table 3). Similar comments within these categories were combined as Issue Statements or suggested alternatives. Representative comments are included for each statement or alternative. In addition, all comment numbers are listed under each heading so that the reader can go to the source letter and read the comment in context if desired.

Many of the responses also contained non-substantive comments that did not speak directly to a particular concern or resource issue. Many of these were general statements of support or opposition to the proposed action. Scoping is an opportunity for the public to raise issues of concern regarding a specific project. It is not meant to simply be a "vote" for or against a proposed action. Many of the comments were requests for additional information. Most of this information will be provided to the public in the forthcoming Draft EIS.

3.1 Alternatives to the Proposed Action

3.1.1 The BLM should seriously consider alternate pipeline routes near or adjacent to the Salt Lake City International Airport.

(005-02, 011-01, 012-01, 012-02, 021-09, 046-11, 046-12, 046-13)

Several commenters questioned the proposed alignment of the pipeline around the airport and asked that other alignments be considered, including those that would minimize impacts to wetlands, follow I-215 more closely, better follow the Kern River corridor, and that cross the airport itself. Representative comments include:

- There are other routes for the UNEV pipeline to go around the SLC Airport other than digging in the wetlands. Proposed follow the Kern River pipeline around airport. Proposed follow the freeways from Woods Cross to I-80 and +/- 5800 South. (011-01)
- Routes that go on airport property should be explored. (046-11)

3.1.2 Locations other than Cedar City should be considered for the terminal.

(026-01, 029-06)

- There needs to be an economic study done of locating the terminal at Cedar City rather than Milford. Milford is closer to all the Southern Utah counties than the terminal at Cedar City. (026-01)
- Why can't the 'Hub Terminal' be run down to Beryl area instead of Cedar City where population and water supply are more scarce??????? (029-06)

3.1.3 The proposed alignment should be moved to the west side of Lynndyl.

(016-02)

- The gasoline pipeline should probably be laid on the west side of Lynndyl where it would not be in such a built-up area as the east side is. (016-02)

3.1.4 The proposed alignment should be moved away from I-15 and closer to Beryl.

(029-05)

- If the pipeline was run closer to the boondox (Beryl) instead of so close to I-15, the adverse impacts would be minimized. (029-05)

3.1.5 The proposed alignment should be spaced a minimum of 50 feet from the Kern River pipeline.

(041-01, 041-02, 041-03, 041-04, 041-05)

- Although the BLM does not issue exclusive right of way grants, Kern River's preferred pipeline separation from a proposed third party pipeline is a minimum of 50 feet away from our nearest pipeline. (041-01)

3.1.6 The proposed pipeline should minimize impacts to fish in Moody Wash.

(021-14)

- The Division recommends that the new pipeline be installed deeper, under the active channel [Moody Wash], or at least, be routed upstream of the existing pipeline, reducing further impacts to fish movements downstream. (021-14)

3.1.7 The BLM should require a double pipe.

(058-06)

- BLM should put in a double pipe to safeguard against oil leaks, pipe bursts, and fire. (058-06)

3.1.8 An alternative alignment that runs on the west side of Tooele Valley should be analyzed in the EIS.

- Action alternative proposed by BLM Salt Lake Field Office.

3.2 Air Quality and Noise Issues

3.2.1 The proposal will require an Approval Order.

(021-01)

- This proposal will require a permit, known as an Approval Order, from the Executive Secretary of the Utah Air Quality Board. (021-01)

3.2.2 Direct emissions (including CO2) from construction and operation activities should be considered.

(021-02, 046-15, 058-05)

- Steps need to be taken to minimize fugitive dust, such as watering and/or chemical stabilization, providing vegetative or synthetic cover or windbreaks. (021-02)
- Consider that fires and oil spills will cause air pollution threatening public health. (058-05)

3.2.3 Indirect and cumulative emissions from Wasatch Front refineries should be considered.

(046-14)

- The EIS needs to address the following: 1. What are the current air emissions for the refineries along the Wasatch front? 2. How much increase would there be in the use of the current refineries due to supplying gas to the Holly pipeline and how much would this increase air emissions (and of what kind)? (046-14)

3.3 Cultural Resources Issues

No comments received.

3.4 Cumulative Effects Issues

3.4.1 Cumulative effects of CO2 emissions from all facets of the proposed action should be considered.

(046-15)

- Given major concerns regarding CO2 emissions there should be a full evaluation of the CO2 emissions that would occur due to all aspects of this project. This evaluation should include (but not be limited to) an examination of the emissions that would occur in getting the increased amount of crude oil to the refineries in North Salt Lake, the emissions that would occur when refining the crude oil to gasoline, the emissions that would occur in building and maintaining the pipeline, the decreases that would occur in shipping the gas via pipeline as compared to truck, and the increase in CO2 emissions due to the increased amount of gasoline that would be delivered through the pipeline as compared to current deliveries of gasoline. (046-15)

3.4.2 Cumulative effects from future linear projects using the proposed UNEV alignment should be considered.

(046-10)

- Another major concern regarding the proposed alignment for the pipeline is the potential cumulative impacts. Specifically, the proposed alignment for the pipeline could become considered the path of least resistance for other potential utilities. (046-10)

3.5 Environmental Justice Issues

No comments received.

3.6 Geology and Minerals Resource Issues

3.6.1 Natural or project-induced earth movement should be considered in the EIS.

(029-03, 046-08)

- All that deep drilling will only exacerbate increased plate/subsidence movement to the detriment of towns so close to I-15!! (029-03)

- Since this area is susceptible to earthquakes, how will any potential earthquakes be addressed? (046-08)

3.7 Hazardous and Solid Waste Materials Issues

3.7.1 Consider the impacts due to spills and leaks.

(021-11, 029-01, 046-05, 058-04)

- The potential for discharge events and potential impacts to wetlands and wildlife should be evaluated. Spill containment, hazardous material, and wildlife clean up plans should also be identified. (021-11)
- Consider that oil spills may occur from pipeline cracks causing land and groundwater pollution, and have plans to clean up oil spills in the shortest possible time. (058-04)

3.7.2 Consider the potential for natural hazards and their impact on the project.

(058-03)

- I am assuming that... BLM will recognize the hazards of explosions, forest fires, land sides, mudflows, and similar events, and put in place and publish emergency measures in the event such hazards do occur. (058-03)

3.8 Land Use Issues

3.8.1 The proposed action could impact private land uses and development potential.

(016-01, 031-01)

- I own irrigated land and some ranch land on the east side of the Lynndyl Townsite. I do not think the proposed pipeline should go through this area. There are irrigated fields in most of the path of the pipeline. I also have a cattle feedyard which would be adversely affected by this kind of construction. (016-01)
- We are concerned about the set-back requirements from the pipeline for residential units. (031-01)

3.8.2 The proposed action could impact existing rights-of-way and claims on public lands.

(020-01, 040-01, 047-01)

- UEC encourages the BLM to locate the pipeline inside the existing footprint of power and gas lines already on the Dixie NF as a way to reduce environmental impacts. (020-01)
- It [pipeline] also goes through mining claims in the area as well as land people use for recreation [on Moapa Reservation]. (047-01)

3.9 Native American Concerns

3.9.1 It is important to work closely with the Moapa Band of the Paiute Tribe to address al Native American concerns.

(014-04)

- Have the tribe contacting agencies. Have good working relationship with tribe. (014-04)

3.10 Paleontological Resources Issues

No comments received.

3.11 Process Issues (Scoping or NEPA)

3.11.1 Having a scoping meeting in Delta was not convenient.

(007-01)

- In reading the list of public meetings you published, I was really surprised by the Delta location vs using Fillmore. The pipeline goes through and effects people in the eastern part of Millard County than in the Delta area, the local BLM office is in Fillmore, it is easier for residents to Nephi & Beaver to go to Fillmore, [and] the cost for local BLM employees to attend a meeting in Delta is greater than if the meeting were held in Fillmore. (007-01)

3.11.2 Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects should be analyzed in the EIS.

(021-10)

- [Provide] an assessment of the direct, indirect, temporary and cumulative impacts from this pipeline and the Kern River pipeline (including all phases from construction, operation, maintenance and long-term management) within this corridor. (021-10)

3.12 Comments on the Proposed Action

3.12.1 The BLM should allow fiber optic lines to be co-located with the pipeline.

(004-01, 030-01)

- You need to allow the rural phone companies to come in after the pipe is laid and put in a conduit for fiber optic cable. (030-01)

3.12.2 The proposed action should incorporate mitigation measures to avoid or minimize impacts to resources and the human environment.

(021-12, 021-15, 048-01, 058-02)

- UDWR recommends, within sensitive habitats, the distance between these [shut-off] valves be condensed to reduce the potential for negative impacts to wildlife and habitats from discharge events. To better protect these habitats, include one shut-off valve prior to entering the wetland complex and one shut-off valve immediately after leaving the wetland complex. (021-12)

- In looking at the proposed route, it will need to cross or go under one or more of Central Utah Water Company's canals. These crossings need to be made by going under the canal(s), not simply by cutting the banks and then patching them. We would also want a signed agreement with the entity in charge of the pipeline that would, in effect, hold Central Utah Water Company harmless if the canal does break at the location of the pipeline crossing and flood someone. (048-01)

3.12.3 The impacts of ongoing maintenance activities and the ultimate responsibility for environmental impacts caused by future pipeline problems should be addressed.

(029-04, 046-09)

- Are there sufficient funds that would set aside to ensure damages would be addressed and repaired? What are the maintenance requirements for a pipeline in this area? How would the maintenance affect the wildlife and the landowners? How long would the pipeline likely be in use? When the pipeline is no longer in use how would it be removed or how would assurances be made that the pipeline would not negatively affect the area? (046-09)

3.12.4 Potential effects of the proposed action on National Forest lands should be considered.

(020-02, 020-03)

- Please disclose and analyze whether there will be pump-stations, equipment storage yards, roads, etc. or other additional structures placed on or near Forest Service land. (020-03)

3.12.5 When siting the pipeline in Clark County, Nevada it should not conflict with the Ground Water Development Project.

(018-01)

- The Authority requests that, when siting the proposed UNEV Pipeline Project, the BLM ensure it would not conflict with the GWD [Clark, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties Groundwater Development] Project facilities. The Authority can provide detailed maps and GIS shapefiles of the GWD Project facilities upon request. (018-01)

3.12.6 The proposed action needs to specify how often maintenance checks will be performed.

(014-03)

- How often/check lines. (014-03)

3.12.7 Water rights may be needed if the proposed action requires diverted water for construction or testing purposes.

(021-04)

- Will also need a water right if they intend to divert water from a natural source for construction and/or testing purposes. (021-04)

3.13 Range Resources Issues

3.13.1 Grazing permittees should be consulted and range resource analyzed for impacts.

(019-01)

- You address everything except the impact on livestock grazing. There should be consultation with the BLM and State permittees who rely on these grazing permits for their livelihood. [Consider] 1. Grazing present and future. 2. Water development pond water access away from construction. 3. Impact of road use. 4. Livestock harassment. (019-01)

3.14 Recreation and Special Interest Area Issues

3.14.1 Recreation activities and areas should be considered in siting the pipeline.

(021-03, 047-01)

- We are concerned that existing or planned recreational activities may be inconsistent with a liquid petroleum products pipeline. (021-03)

3.15 Socioeconomics Issues

3.15.1 The proposed action may positively affect general socioeconomics of the local communities by providing jobs and helping businesses.

(014-02, 053-01)

- Employment opportunities – from SLC to LV, NV. (014-02)
- It is not an uncommon thing to have long distance gas lines servicing both cities and rural areas, and this would be a good service for businesses of Utah and Las Vegas, resulting in desirable economic growth. (053-01)

3.15.2 The proposed action may negatively affect the local (Utah) economy by decreasing availability of refined petroleum products and increase prices.

(025-01, 056-01)

- The pipeline will not lower prices but rather will increase fuel prices... (025-01)
- The loss of the production capabilities will also be a severe detriment to our local economy. We already hear "lack of capacity" as the reason for our current petroleum prices. Why would we want to allow these "Scarce" resources to be shipped out of state? (056-01)

3.15.3 The proposed action may negatively affect property values or existing businesses.

(013-01, 016-01, 027-01)

- The potential damage to the value of our 439 acres is considerable. It would limit future development potential... (013-01)

- I own irrigated land and some ranch land on the east side of the Lynndyl Townsite. ...I also have a cattle feedyard which would be adversely affected by this kind of construction. (016-01)

3.15.4 The proposed action may increase local tax burdens of property owners.

(029-02)

- Who will pay the brunt of the increased taxes for the project? (029-02)

3.15.5 An economic study should be completed to best site the terminal in Utah.

(026-01)

- There needs to be an economic study done of locating the terminal at Cedar City rather than Milford. Milford is closer to all the Southern Utah counties than the terminal at Cedar City. (026-01)

3.16 Soil Resources Issues

3.16.1 Wetland soils may not be suitable for the project.

(032-01, 046-06)

- Are the soils suitable for a pipeline in this area? [referring to wetlands] (046-04)

3.17 Special Status Species Issues

3.17.1 Construction and operation activities of the Proposed Action may have direct and indirect impacts on desert tortoise habitat and individuals within the project area. Mitigation and appropriate monitoring should be incorporated into the project.

(022-01, 022-02, 022-03, 022-04, 022-06)

- The construction and operation of the proposed pipeline will cause and exacerbate problems for the Desert Tortoise, including habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, raven predation and increased mortality from vehicles and off-roading activities. The EIS must identify and analyze these impacts, and identify ways to reduce or eliminate them. (022-01)
- The corridor will cross or affect at least four areas designated and managed for Desert Tortoise recovery:
  The Coyote Spring Unit, Lincoln County, NV
  The Beaver Dam Slope Unit, Lincoln County, NV
  The Beaver Dam Slope Unit, Washington County, UT
  The Upper Virgin River Unit, Washington County, UT (022-02)
- Construction and maintenance personal must all be trained to watch for tortoises and to follow the proper steps when a tortoise is encountered. (022-04)

3.17.2 Stream construction should be avoided during critical spawning months.

(021-13)

- Construction activities that may result in any disturbance to the stream should not be completed during critical spawning months. Therefore, the Division strongly recommends that construction activities impacting these streams occur outside this spawning period (April 1 -June 30). (021-13)

3.17.3 Access to construction or maintenance roads should be restricted to limit habitat degradation.

(022-05)

- Access and maintenance roads should be gated to limit access to construction and maintenance personnel and vehicles only and to discourage access by off-roaders, trash dumpers, shooters and others. (022-05)

3.18 Transportation Issues

3.18.1 Installation of the pipeline may reduce the number of petroleum trucks on the highway and improve traffic congestion.

(045-01, 054-01)

- I live in St. George and travel 1-15 often. I have been concerned about the number of petroleum tank trucks that travel this busy interstate highway. I think it would be of great benefit to have this pipeline and get many of these trucks off the interstate. (045-01)

3.18.2 Traffic may be impacted if major repairs or maintenance are required.

(029-01)

- If there is a leak anywhere on the line that could cause a major catastrophe (fires/foul air/polluted soil, water, etc.) and traffic gridlocks while trucks jam the area to build/do repairs! (029-01)

3.19 Vegetation Resources Issues

3.19.1 Disturbed areas are prone to noxious weed establishment. The EIS needs to determine what vegetation resources would be disturbed and include revegetation and monitoring plans.

(039-01, 046-04)

- I think there has been enough pipeline activity thru our property, every time you come thru and tear up the environment noxious weeds come back and it takes 2 years for the reseed to take hold under good conditions. Sometime's it has to be reseeded twice! (039-01)
- What vegetation would be impacted? What re-vegetation efforts would occur for the impacted vegetation? How long would this re-vegetation effort be monitored? (046-04)

3.20 Visual Resources Issues

No comments received.

3.21 Water Resources Issues

3.21.1 The Proposed Action could affect wetlands. The EIS should incorporate wetland delineations to determine wetland location, type, function, and potential impacts.

(005-01, 021-05, 021-06, 021-08, 046-01, 046-02, 046-07)

- On the western side of the SLCIA, the alignment is proposed along the boundary, but approximately 2000' west of the Kern River pipeline. This proposed location will negatively impact a large wetland complex that has been previously undisturbed. (021-05)
- One of the main concerns regarding this pipeline is the potential impacts it would have on the wetlands to the north and west of the Salt Lake International Airport. (046-01)

3.21.2 Prolonged flooding from the Great Salt Lake may affect the pipeline and habitat within the pipeline corridor.

(021-08)

- An evaluation of the impact to the pipeline, and habitats within the pipeline corridor during high GSL levels when the area may be flooded for several years. (021-08)

3.22 Wildlife Issues

3.22.1 The EIS should analyze potential impacts to waterbirds and migratory birds.

(021-07, 046-03)

- An evaluation of UDWR's Great Salt Lake Ecosystem Project Waterbird survey results to ascertain the species of birds that may be impacted by the project. (021-06)
- When would the impacts occur and would the initial placement of the pipeline take place to minimize impacts on nesting and/or migratory birds? (046-03)

3.22.2 Stream-related construction activities should include mitigation to protect fish species, including temporal restrictions and salvage operations as needed (see Section 3.17.2).

(021-13, 021-15)

- Construction activities that may result in any disturbance to the stream should not be completed during critical spawning months. Therefore, the Division strongly recommends that construction activities impacting these streams occur outside this spawning period (April 1 -June 30). (021-13)
- Fish salvage activities most be performed before any construction activities begin in order to minimize impacts on native fish. (021-15)

3.22.3 The pipeline corridor should not fragment wildlife habitat.

(058-01)

- I am assuming that... provision will be made for animal crossing over the pipeline corridor. (058-01)

Chapter 4 - Future Public Involvement

4.1 Continuing Opportunities for Public Involvement

Public comments will be solicited on the Draft EIS. A notice of availability will be sent to all those that provided comment during public scoping or who requested that they be kept informed of the process.

4.2 Contact Information

Contact regarding the proposed action and issues related to the EIS should be made in one of the following ways:

Mail

Rhonda Flynn

Bureau of Land Management

Utah State Office

440 West 200 South

PO Box 45155

Salt Lake City, Utah 84145

Visit

BLM Utah State Office

440 West 200 South

5th Floor

Salt Lake City, Utah

Phone

801-539-4132

Fax

801-539-4200

E-mail

UT_UNEV_Pipeline_EIS@blm.gov

APPENDIX A: EXHIBITS

Notice of Intent
Legal Notices
Press Release
Scoping Letter
Scoping Meeting Handouts and Posters
Comment Form

APPENDIX B: ATTENDANCE LISTS

APPENDIX C: LIST OF RESPONDENTS

APPENDIX D: PUBLIC COMMENTS